

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application, in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The examiner rejects claims 1-13 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gfeller in view of Solinsky. The examiner states his rejection that Gfeller permits signal lock if the origin of the received light beam is different from the optical wireless link containing the photodetector and refers to column 6, line 64 to column 7, lines 25 of Gfeller.

The examiner has missed the point that Gfeller et al specifically teaches away from the concept of locking onto a single light beam. Referring to the abstract, the last sentence in the first paragraph recites: "Each terminal may receive overlapping signals from several satellites without disturbance." The last sentence of the second paragraph recites: "Each satellite has means (63) for comparing any transferred uplink packet to a packet still stored in its buffer so that any packet is transferred only once to the host and doubly stored packets are eliminated.". Clearly, Gfeller et al is not involved with locking on to a single source, but is involves having multiple sources send signals to the satellite, and then only transfer a single receipt of the packet to another satellite. Thus, when the examiner states that it "permits signal lock if the origin of the received light beam is different", this is incorrect, because there is no signal lock in Gfeller et al.

The examiner refers to column 8, lines 1-52 of Solinsky as preventing the locking on to a reflected light beam originating from its steerable light beam transmitter. This is respectively traversed. Referring to column 7, lines 24-27, it recites that the search signal 100 is in response to a retro-reflected frequency detection signal 106. Such a signal comes from a retro-reflector and is thus a reflected signal originating from the light beam transmitter, exactly the opposite of what the examiner has stated. Furthermore, at column 8, lines 1-6 it recites: "When decision processor 96a detects

the presence of signal having a modulation at  $f_1$ , indicating a transmitted beam a reflection by optics 12b and 14b of transceiver 10b, it notifies system controller 70a, which reduces the size of the search mode spiral region for transceiver 10a.”. At column 8, lines 12-15 it recites: “Each transceiver 10 is receiving only a reflection 34 of its own beam 30 (or a portion of it)”. (emphasis added). Therefore, it is clear that it is intended for this system to receive a reflected signal in order to locate a second device, where as the present invention is directed to avoid the reflection that Solinsky requires.

Accordingly, neither reference cited by the examiner, either singly or in combination shows or even suggests the combination recited in the present claims. The examiner’s rejection should thus be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant’s believe that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Texas Instruments Incorporated

/William B Kempler/  
William B. Kempler  
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel  
Reg. No. 28,228  
Tel.: (972) 917-5452

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.